

cation, church extension, Sunday schools etc.

"Is is Revolution" or Evolution. Is there a mutual understanding, privately, among the leaders of the conservative armies to march them to the front, into the Progressive camp and fight the enemies of the Bible under the only genuine "Gospel Alone" banner that is unfurled at the point of any branch of the Lord's hosts: Who can answer these questions.

We gladly extend to them the right hand of fellowship and congratulate them on their rapid progress. Having declared their purpose by implication, to cast off the eviled togs of tradition and custom, we hope they will raise our banner aloft, the glorious old banner first unfurled by Alex. Mack, and his seven immortal compears in 1708, and we will move together in the holy work of preaching this Gospel to all nations for a testimony against them."

Another instance that illustrates the revolutionary strides of the old organization is its attitude on the subject of missions. From a state of unrenting hostility to win the semblance of missionary work, win the word "missionary" they have, with one prodigious bound, passed to the utmost extreme and leaving the millions of their own countrymen in "outer darkness" they are preparing to enter the antipodes with the Tunker dress customs in the van.

Less than a decade and a half since, when Eld. H. R. Holsinger editor of the Christian Family Companion and when the first rumblings of the storms that foretold the disintegration of the once solid Tunker church were heard, when the battle for progress and intellectual and spiritual freedom was raging; at Bro Holsinger's request I wrote up what was called "The missionary column," the first of a series of communications on the missionary question. At that time the public discussion of that subject was very offensive to most of the old elders and we were advised to employ a less obnoxious than "missionary" word. Now the missionaries of the church are among its most honored members and the immediate future promises more startling developments in that line of progress.

In the meantime the "order" continues to be the test of official qualification and the holy ordinance of baptism is contingent on a qualified promise to conform thereto.

Can any one explain such an anomaly.

WHAT I THINK OF THE CONFERENCE.

BY DANIEL MILLER.

This is the proper time for an understanding what we mean by our Conferences, and therefore ask to be heard.

Conference—what is it? The meaning of a Conference can only be appreciated by the object for which it is called. We give names to gatherings of people according to the nature of their work. We called our coming together heretofore Conventions. Now the same is called Conference. Well, it makes no difference what it is called, so we understand what is meant. A rose by any other name would smell just as sweet. A meeting for political purposes and largely attended is called a convention: and usually a religious meeting largely attended is called a Conference.

Yet all this does not tell what our Conference is: or what its mission or power is: and that is WHAT EVERY ONE WANTS TO KNOW. And so do I. If it is to make laws for God, there is one brother that objects. But if the Conference is for the children of the Heavenly King to meet together to instruct one another in Holy things, and discuss subjects that will more vividly point to the Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world: then that same brother will say, amen.

The undersigned was once a member of the G. B. B. and was the author of an article contained in the daily paper published at the famous Arnold grove A. M. The article was commending these meetings because under no other circumstances could those fraternal greetings be enjoyed by friends who meet so numerously from great distances, and interchange thoughts. I am still of that opinion; even in the G. B. B. fraternity: and that this feature is the only one commendable. Our own Conference is no exception. If any thing else is to be done except simply exchange views and thoughts, enlighten and instruct one another, and then adjourn, our coming together will not be for the better but for the worse.

It appears that many of our brethren have imbibed notions from the old Church that every time we meet in Conference a new effort is made to bring about what may without straining

a construction, be called A DISCIPLINE. Just let that principal get a foothold in the Brotherhood and that will be our epitaph. Our discipline was written long ago; we want no addition to it.

Preach the Gospel. That is what we can do at our Conference. We can teach each other what the Gospel teaches, and help others to unload that superstition that the Gospel does not teach. The later is about as important as the former.

We may have very different views on many subjects, but we have no right to vote another member out of Heaven: that is what these national Conferences usually mean; because some body dont believe as we do: neither is it wisdom to vote somebody into Heaven because he believes as we do, if the Lord did not want him there. That was the way we used to do in the old Church: we would vote the accused either up or down; whichever way the majority wanted him.

If the Conference at Ashland would be fully converted to this theory, that many of us used to believe in; that whatsoever we would bind on earth should be bound in Heaven, we would certainly have a very interesting Conference. Just last EVANGELIST contained an article from P. J. Brown wherein we understand that he does not believe in Divine healing; and at the same time an article from the pen of I. D. Bowman that implies that he does believe in Divine healing. Of course if the majority of Conference believed in the healing Brown would go down and Bowman up. But suppose the majority were the other, way then Brown would go up, and Bowman down. Well that is the way it used to be done, but I got away from that way of doing, and don't want to go back.

The Lord had much to do with the creation of man or the human family: and he made them that in all this great number not two are just alike. That is, there never were two persons known that they could not be distinguished from each other. Their disposition is no more alike than their physiognomy. It is here granted that it was the Lord that made "many men of many minds." He has also given a law, a principle that we can live together in peace and harmony, not with standing